REMARKS

Claims 1-84 were pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 18-20, 32-40, and 58 have been amended. Accordingly, clams 1-84 remain pending.

I. Claim Count

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 1-**83** are pending. As noted above, Applicants believe that claims 1-**84** are pending.

II. Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview conducted on January 22, 2010. The claims and the Halahmi and Fredrickson references were discussed. The amendments to the claims reflect the Examiner's suggestions and comments from the interview.

III. Amendments to the Specification

For clarity, certain paragraphs in Specification, which are identified above, have been amended to change "senuous" to "perceptible" and "number's screenfulls against" to "number of screenfulls of data of."

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 15-20, 32-41, and 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Halahmi (US 2003/0011631) ("Halahmi"), and further in view of Fredrickson et al. (US 3872460) ("Fredrickson").

In response, claim 1 has been amended as follows:

> Claim 1 (Currently amended): A method of rendering a page, comprising:
> starting obtaining operation for obtaining, over a network, a page made by a markup language in response to a user request for the page;
> performing a text browsing mode operation on obtained part of data of the page in parallel with the obtaining operation of the page;

displaying text from the obtained part of data of the page in a text browsing mode without using definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page as designated by a markup language document of the page;

judging whether or not acquisition of the definition information is obtained from over the network; and

switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen representation in the text browsing mode in which the definition information is not applied, to onscreen representation in which the definition information is applied.

(Emphasis added).

As recited in claim 1, the text of a page can be displayed to the user before the "definition information," which defines the layout and design, for example, of the page including the text, is fully obtained from over a network.

In contrast, Halahmi discloses displaying rendered portions of a web page without waiting for all the portions of the document to be downloaded. (Abstract). More specifically, a rendered portion includes applying HTML tags, graphics, and/or MPEG video data, to "properly display[] each portion." (Paragraph [0028]). For example, see paragraphs [0024] and [0028]-[0030] of Halahmi.

As such, Halahmi fails to at least disclose or suggest "displaying text from the obtained part of data of the page in a text browsing mode without using definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page as designated by a markup language document of the page," as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Further, in contrast to the claims, Fredrickson discloses a system for a user to enter in a desired layout for text, which is displayed on a video screen. Further, Fredrickson discloses entering the text to the system by physically processing "tape," including the text, in the system. (Col. 1, lines 38-40). The user, "[u]sing a keyboard-directed cursor and copyfitting keys," changes the layout of the text displayed on the screen." (Col. 1, lines 40-44).

Thus, Fredrickson at least fails to disclose or suggest, "starting obtaining operation for obtaining, **over a network**, a page made by a markup language in response to a user request for the

page," and "displaying text from the obtained part of data of the page in a text browsing mode without using definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page as designated by a markup language document of the page." (Emphasis added).

Therefore, Fredrickson fails to cure the deficiencies of Halahmi. Thus, Halahmi and Fredrickson, alone or in combination, fail to teach every element of rendering a page as recited in claim 1. Independent claims 18-20 and 32-40 have been similarly amended.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 15-20, 32-41, and 55-58 are allowable over Halahmi in view of Fredrickson. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 15-20, 32-41, and 55-58.

Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 21, 24-26, 28-29, 42, 45-47, 49, 59, 62-64, 66, 72, 75-77, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Halahmi and Fredrickson, and further in view of Sai (US 2004/0085331) ("Sai"). Further, claims 10-12, 14, 50-52, 54, 67-69, 71, 80-82, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Halahmi and Fredrickson, and further in view of Brosnahan (US 7082577) ("Brosnahan"). Lastly, claims 13, 53, 70, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Halahmi, Fredrickson, and Brosnahan and further in view of Chang et al. (US 2002/0010707) ("Chang").

In response, Applicants submit that Sai, Brosnahan, and Chang each fail to cure the deficiencies of Halami and Fredrickson. As such, for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 2, 5-7, 9-14, 21, 24-26, 28-29, 42, 45-47, 49-52, 54, 62-64, 66-72, 75-77, and 79-84 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 5-7, 9-14, 21, 24-26, 28-29, 42, 45-47, 49-52, 54, 62-64, 66-72, 75-77, and 79-84.

V. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating claims 3-4, 8, 22-23, 27, 30-31, 43-44, 48, 60-61, 65, 73-74, and 78 contain allowable subject matter. However, claims 3-4, 8, 22-23, 27, 30-31, 43-44, 48, 60-61, 65, 73-74, and 78 are objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicants do not believe such an amendment is necessary in view of the amendments and remarks included in this document.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **448252001300**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: February 19, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Peter J. Yim/
Peter J. Yim
Registration No.: 44,417

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Telephone: 415.268.6373
Fax: 415.268.7522